

REMARKS

The claims have been amended to more clearly define the invention as disclosed in the written description. In particular, claims 1, 4, 8, 9 and 10 have been amended for clarity.

Applicants believe that the above changes answer the Examiner's objection to the claims and respectfully request withdrawal thereof.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1 and 4-11 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,166,496 to Lys et al. The Examiner has further rejected claims 2 and 3 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lys et al. in view of U.S. Patent 6,689,947 to Ludwig.

The Lys et al. patent discloses a lighting entertainment system in which lighting elements are controlled by a lighting signal. As noted in the Abstract, "A system is provided for combining an illumination control signal and an entertainment signal. At a decoder, the combined signal may be decoded into an entertainment signal that is delivered to an entertainment device, and an illumination control signal that is delivered to an illumination source."

As noted in MPEP §2131, it is well-founded that "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Further, "The identical invention must be shown in as

complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Independent claims 1 and 8 include the limitations "analyzing the received video signal to determine video properties of an image formed by the video signal" and "setting a property of ambient light generated by the at least one ambient light source based upon the determined video properties".

The Examiner indicates that Lys et al. teaches analyzing the video signal, and setting a property of the ambient light based upon the analyzed video signal, and references Fig. 85, and col. 47, line 60 to col. 49, line 8.

Applicants submit that the Examiner is mistaken. In particular, as indicated in Lys et al. at col. 9, line 41 to col. 10, line 27, the Lys et al. system is based on the control of light modules 100 using a lighting control signal from a control device 504. Continuing on, Lys et al. describes the embodiment of Fig. 85 at col. 47, lines 61-67, "the signal-generating device 504 may be a generator of a television, stereo, or other conventional electronic entertainment signal. That is, the **lighting control signal can be embedded** in any music, compact disc, television, videotape, video game, computer web site, cybercast or other broadcast, cable, broadband or other communications signal. (emphasis added" Lys et al. further describes this system with reference to Fig. 86, and states, at col. 48, lines 29-32, "Referring to FIG. 86, lighting control data may be added to the signal generated by the signal

generator through use of a data encoder or multiplexor 508."

Further, at col. 48, lines 53-58, Lys et al. states "A decoder 518 may be designed to separate the lighting control data from the entertainment signal. The decoder 518 may be a decoder box similar to that used to decode closed-captioning or other combined signals". Hence, while Lys et al. is arguably analyzing the television signal, it is detecting the encoded lighting control signal, and not video properties of an image formed by the video signal.

The subject invention, on the other hand, analyzes the video signal to determine video properties of an image formed by the video signal.

Applicants therefore submit that Lys et al. sets a property of ambient light generated by the at least one ambient light source based upon the detected light control signal (that was previously embedded in the television signal), and not on determined video properties of an image formed by the video signal.

The Ludwig patent discloses a real-time floor controller for control of music, signal processing, mixing, video, lighting, and other systems, in which it is disclosed that recognition of human facial expressions from video images may be used as a controller for sound, lighting and special effects. However, Applicants submit that Ludwig does not supply that which is missing from Lys et al., i.e., "analyzing the received video signal to determine video properties of an image formed by the video signal" and "setting a property of ambient light generated by the at least

one ambient light source based upon the determined video properties".

In view of the above, Applicants believe that the subject invention, as claimed, is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by the prior art, either individually or collectively, and as such, is patentable thereover.

Applicants believe that this application, containing claims 1-11, is now in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

by /Edward W. Goodman/
Edward W. Goodman, Reg. 28,613
Attorney
Tel.: 914-333-9611